

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated December 18, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claim 21 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 1-20, 22-30 and 32-34 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 9-10, 18, 22 and 24 are amended. No new matter is added.

I. Response to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that it is not clear how the cover is opened by the ammunition upon deployment.

Claim 21 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner alleges that it is not clear how the ammunition opens the cover arrangement so that the cover arrangement closes subsequent to the deployment.

Applicant submits that, in an exemplary embodiment of the invention, the cover may be provided with a hinge and a spring. *See* page 12, lines 20-23 of the specification. The cover may be opened by the gas pressure built up by the ammunition. Further, the cover may be held open or closed by the hinge and spring mechanism. The hinge and the spring mechanism clearly provides an exemplary embodiment of the cover arrangement. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 10 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner alleges that specification does not provide enablement for the hatch being a squeeze lock.

Applicant has amended claim 10. The amendments made are believed to be self-explanatory. Claim 10 is believed to meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

II. Response to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-23, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'ooge (U.S. Patent No. 3,499,364, hereinafter "D'ooge") in view of Deckard *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,686,866, hereinafter "Deckard"). In addition, claims 24-26, 28 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'ooge as modified by Deckard *et al.* as applied to claims 1, 21 and 27 above, and further in view of Elkouh *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,444,592, hereinafter "Elkouh").

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a recess (2) in a body shell (1) of a vehicle provided for ammunition deployment is covered by a cover arrangement (4) that reduces a radar signature caused by the recess (2)[.]" The above recited feature is not taught or suggested by D'ooge or Deckard.

D'ooge discloses a missile 42 having a body section 24 and a releasable nose section 26. *See* col. 1, lines, 57-65.

Deckard discloses flares having a radar absorbing end cap. *See* abstract.

Neither D'ooge nor Deckard teaches or suggests a recess in a body shell of a vehicle provided for ammunition deployment is covered by a cover arrangement that reduces a radar

signature caused by the recess, as described in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be patentable over D'ooge and Deckard.

Elkouh is cited as teaching miscellaneous features recited in the dependent claims. Applicant notes that Elkouh does not bridge the deficiencies of D'ooge and Deckard in teaching or suggesting that “a recess (2) in a body shell (1) of a vehicle provided for ammunition deployment is covered by a cover arrangement (4) that reduces a radar signature caused by the recess (2)[.]” Thus, claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-20, 22-30, 32-34 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Claim 21 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Facciano *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0189432, hereinafter “Facciano”) in view of Kuchta *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,123,005, hereinafter “Kuchta”).

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a recess (2) in a body shell (1) of a vehicle provided for ammunition deployment is covered by a cover arrangement (4) that reduces a radar signature caused by the recess (2)[.]” The above recited feature is not taught or suggested by Facciano.

Facciano relates to a canister for a missile. The canister includes a cover 90 that disintegrates during canister pressurization and missile launch. *See* paragraph 15.

Kuchta relates to an extended canister with cover, in which the cover bursts after firing of the missile. *See* abstract.

Neither Facciano nor Kuchta teaches or suggests a recess in a body shell of a vehicle provided for ammunition deployment is covered by a cover arrangement that reduces a radar

signature caused by the recess, as described in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be patentable over Facciano and Kuchta.


In view of the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable. Claim 17 is patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 1.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



George F. Lehnigk
Registration No. 36,359

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 18, 2007